

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

IN RE J&J INVESTMENT
LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-cv-00529-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 96]

Pending before the Court is Defendant Wells Fargo’s motion to compel discovery. Docket No. 96.¹ Plaintiffs filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 106. Defendant filed a reply. Docket No. 107.

One aspect of the pending motion practice addresses whether Plaintiffs must identify putative class members and contact information. Docket No. 96 at 17. Plaintiffs respond by arguing that, *inter alia*, Defendant can obtain such information from the Receiver. *See* Docket No. 106 at 16; *see also S.E.C. v. Beasley*, No. 2:22-cv-00612-CDS-EJY, Docket No. 88 at 18 (D. Nev. June 3, 2022) (requiring the Receiver to create a list of “known creditors,” as well as their addresses and the amounts of their claims).²

After the motion to compel was briefed, the Court granted the stipulation to coordinate discovery in this action with discovery in the Receiver’s case. Docket No. 110. Among other reasons advanced for that order, the parties sought to minimize discovery burdens by “coordinat[ing] discovery between the cases to the extent practicable in order to avoid the

¹ The Court cites herein to the CMECF pagination, rather than the native pagination within the filed documents.

² Because the Receiver is identifying “creditors” with moneys to be claimed, it appears the Receiver is tasked with identifying those investors who lost money in the alleged scheme (*i.e.*, a list of investors that excludes the winners). *See id.*

unnecessary expenditure of time, effort, and expense by the parties, courts, and witnesses associated with duplicative discovery.” Docket No. 110 at 2. That agreement also accounted for the expedited production and review of documents held by the Receiver. *See id.*

No later than July 24, 2023, Defendant must file a status report indicating whether the Receiver has produced the list of creditors.³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 10, 2023



Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

³ If the production status of this information is not readily discernible to Defendant, it must confer with the Receiver on whether and when such information will be produced to Defendant.